THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L. NARASIMHA REDDY

WRIT PETITION No. 17902 OF 2005

DATED: 31.08.2005

Between:

Y. Prabhakar Reddy

... PETITIONER

AND

The Vice Chairman & Managing Director,

A.P. Scheduled Castes Cooperative

Finance Corporation Limited, Hydrabad.

... RESPONDENTS

ORAL ORDER:

The petitioner challenges the order, dated 06.08.2005, passed by the respondent, whereunder, he was placed under suspension. The petitioner is working as Deputy Executive Engineer in the Nalgonda District Scheduled Caste Service Cooperative Society Limited. He was placed under suspension on the allegation that he misled the Enquiry Officer by stating that he paid a sum of Rs.70,000/- to a contractor by name K. Srinadha Reddy.

The petitioner contends that the contractor by name K.Srinadha Reddy had fabricated some copies of the official correspondence and submitted a frivolous complaint. He has referred to the various letters and proceedings, such as, the one dated 30.09.2002, addressed by him to the Deputy Chief Engineer, another letter, dated 23.05.2003, and the copies of allegedly manipulated letters.

In its counter-affidavit, the respondent has denied the allegations of the petitioner and stated that the truth or otherwise of the allegations against the petitioner can be established only in the ensuing enquiry.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned counsel for the respondent.

In the normal course of things, this Court does not interfere with the orders of suspension, pending enquiry. Having regard to the peculiar circumstances of the case, an interim order was passed, on 12.08.2005, suspending the impugned order. A broad perusal of the record discloses that no monetary loss, as such, was pointed out, and much can be said as to the genuity of the complaint stated to have been submitted by one of the contractors. This Court does not intend to delve deep into the matter for the simple reason that the petitioner has since been reinstated into service and was transferred to a different place. The interests of the respondent is adequately protected and it can proceed with the enquiry without any hindrance.

For the foregoing reasons, the writ petition is disposed of, directing that in view of the reinstatement of the petitioner by the respondent through order, dated 25.08.2005, no further orders are necessary, and that it shall be open to the respondent to proceed with the enquiry. No order as to costs.

_____

31.08.2005

ES